

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are two (2) sheets of corrected formal drawings that comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

Numerals 10 and 20 have been switched.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-3 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the Amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Drawings

Figs. 3 and 4 were objected to because the numerals 10 and 20 did not agree with the specification. By way of the corrected drawings, these numerals have been reversed so they agree with Fig. 1 and the specification. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Lee et al (U.S. Patent 6,077,054). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out that Lee et al shows a reciprocating motor with a frame having cylinder block 53 and an unlabeled annular ring lying between the cylinder block and the back iron 60. The cylinder block 53 is also connected to the outer core 100.

Applicants submit that the claims are not anticipated by this reference.

First, Applicants note that the Examiner has indicated that the unlabeled annular element between the back iron and the cylinder block is made of stainless steel. In fact, this unlabeled area is not described in any fashion in the reference and its material is not given. The Examiner is requested to explain why he thinks this element is made of stainless steel. It is noted that the specification states on column 3, lines 52-53 that the back iron 60 is attached to the outer circumference of the cylinder block 53 and no description of this element which lies between the two is described. In view of this lack of description, Applicants submit that it is not proper to assume that this element is stainless steel or that it is of a different material than the cylinder block and the back iron.

Furthermore, claim 1 now describes the stator fastening structure as a combination of elements including a frame having an outer core fixing member and an inner core fixing member, where the outer core fixing member is fixed to an end of the outer core and the inner core fixing member is fixed to a corresponding end of the inner core. The two fixing members are joined together near these ends. The two fixing members are formed of different materials. Applicants

submit that the reference does not show this combination of elements. While the cylinder block of Lee et al is connected to an end of the outer core, there is no element which is connected to this same end of the inner core. Instead, the back iron, which corresponds to the inner core is attached through its cylindrical side rather than the end to the cylinder block through the unlabeled element. Further, the reference does not show fixing members joined together near these ends. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by this reference.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and as such is also considered to be allowable. In addition, the Examiner notes that stainless steel is nonmagnetic. However, as noted above, Applicants submit that the reference does not specify this element as being made of stainless steel. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this claim is additionally allowable.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Benson (U.S. Patent 4,454,426). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Benson shows a frame formed by plastic section 43 which is attached to outer core 57b and tie bolt 52 formed of magnetic material. The tie bolt is attached to and supports the inner core 48. Applicants submit that this reference does not teach

all the elements of claim 1 and accordingly, these claims are not anticipated thereby.

The Benson device includes a frame including end wall 43 and cylindrical wall 41 which carry iron flux return elements 57a and 57b. The central portion 42 includes coils 12a and 12b enclosed by iron core elements 48a and 48b and separated by insulative spacer 50. This assembly is held in place by titanium tie bolt 52. The stator portions 41 and 43 as well as the spacer are made of a nonmagnetic structural material such as fiberglass (column 8, line 35).

As pointed out above in regard to the previous rejection, claim 1 now describes the outer core fixing member as being connected to an end of the outer core. This is not the case in Benson. Also, claim 1 describes the inner core fixing member as being connected to an end of the inner core, which is not the case in Benson if this member is considered to be the titanium bolt as described by the Examiner. Also, although both the titanium bolt and the stator walls are different materials, they are both non-magnetic. Titanium is a metal that has magnetic properties approximately equal to aluminum. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by this reference.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and as such is also considered to be allowable. Further, Applicants submit that neither fiberglass nor

titanium are considered magnetic materials. Accordingly, these claims are additionally allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicant respectfully petitions for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$420.00 is attached hereto.

Appl. No. 09/986,685
Atty. Docket: 0630-1357P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By James T. Eller, Jr. #41,458
James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JTE/RFG/mlr
0630-1357P

Attachment(s): Corrected Formal Drawings - Two (2) sheets